



C O N T E N T S

Agenda item 67:	
International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (<i>continued</i>)	367

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 67

International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (A/2734, A/2738, A/C.1/758, A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.106) (*continued*)

1. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) wished, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105), to explain the revised text of that draft (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) which was now before the Committee. From the outset, the purpose of the co-sponsors had been to establish a programme that was feasible, and on which work could be started no later than 1955. Believing, however, that the final text should reflect, as far as possible, the views of the Committee as a whole, they had made changes in the original draft in response to suggestions made by various delegations, in particular, the delegations of the Soviet Union and India. With regard to the amendments suggested by the Soviet Union, Mr. Lodge stated that there had been private discussions with Mr. Vyshinsky, who had signified his acceptance of most of the provisions of the revised text.

2. Turning to the specific changes made in the draft, Mr. Lodge pointed out that a paragraph had been added to the preamble to the effect that the General Assembly desired to promote energetically the use of atomic energy to the end that it would serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind. The clause reflected one of the points which the Soviet Union representative had raised. It should not, however, be interpreted as an acceptance of the principle of prohibition of atomic weapons without proper safeguards.

3. What had formerly been the second paragraph of the preamble had been amended in response to a suggestion by the Indian representative. In its new version, it recognized the importance and the urgency of international co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

4. The second paragraph of the preamble to section A had been amended by the insertion of a phrase indicating that the parties concerned intended to continue the negotiations in progress on the establishment of the agency. That change had been made to meet a suggestion by the representative of the Soviet Union.

5. At the request of the Indian representative, a new paragraph—paragraph 1—had been included in the operative part of section A, expressing the hope that the international agency would be established without delay.

6. The former paragraph 1—now paragraph 2—of the operative part of section A had been amended. The text no longer indicated that the agreement between the agency and the United Nations should be similar to those of the specialized agencies. It had become apparent that several delegations, including that of the Soviet Union, objected to that notion, and it had accordingly seemed desirable not to decide at that stage the nature of the relationship between the United Nations and the future agency.

7. The next change, in former paragraph 3—now paragraph 4—of the operative part of section A, reflected the desire expressed by a number of delegations that the negotiating States should consult them on the question of the establishment of the agency. The addition was useful and would not complicate the procedure.

8. Lastly, in paragraph 2 of section B of the draft resolution, the words “of Governments” had been added to the definition of the international technical conference, in response to a suggestion by the representative of India.

9. The representative of the Soviet Union had proposed an amendment to paragraph 3 of section B to the effect that not only States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies should be invited to the conference, but all other States which expressed a desire to participate. The seven Powers had not been able to accept that amendment, believing that the current debate was not the place to settle the question of the status of States which were not Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies.

10. The seven Powers hoped that the revised draft resolution, which took into consideration the suggestions made during the debate, would be adopted unanimously. They also hoped that by the following session of the General Assembly a report could be presented on the results achieved in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy, instead of merely on the methods of achieving international co-operation in that field.

11. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had little to add to what the United States representative had just said. The purpose of the first amendment he had submitted to the representatives of the seven Powers had been to express the desire that atomic energy should be used for peaceful purposes only. The preamble to the revised draft resolution contained a new paragraph which reflected the USSR delegation's view and which was therefore acceptable. He emphasized the significance

of the wording of that paragraph, and especially of the word "only".

12. The Soviet delegation had also indicated that it was important that the negotiations in progress should be continued. That idea was now expressed in the second paragraph of the preamble to section A, which was thus entirely acceptable.

13. The original text of the seven-Power draft resolution had provided that, once the agency was established, it should negotiate an agreement with the United Nations similar to those of the specialized agencies. That wording had not met the wishes of the Soviet Union delegation. Mr. Vyshinsky welcomed the deletion of the analogy with the specialized agencies. A formula would have to be found which would make it clear that the agency was answerable to the General Assembly and the Security Council. At the present stage, however, the revised wording was acceptable.

14. It was also gratifying to note that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not included in their text the idea that the agency should be established "under the aegis" of the United Nations. That wording would have been inconsistent with the provisions of paragraph 2 of section A, since the specialized agencies were also under the aegis of the United Nations, and the inclusion of such a phrase would have intimated that the relationship between the international agency and the United Nations was similar to those between the Organization and the specialized agencies.

15. The USSR delegation felt that the new operative paragraph 1 of section A constituted a desirable amendment.

16. The new wording of paragraph 5 of section B, prescribing the composition of the small committee, was also acceptable to the USSR delegation.

17. On one point, however, the delegations of the seven Powers and the delegation of the Soviet Union had been unable to agree. Under paragraph 3 of section B, States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies were invited to participate in the conference. The USSR delegation considered that that provision was inadequate.

18. Moreover, it seemed to be at variance with the position rightly adopted by the United States Government up to that time. On 23 September 1954 (475th plenary meeting), Mr. Dulles had announced to the General Assembly that he contemplated the creation of an international agency to include nations from all regions of the world, and had added explicitly that no nation was excluded from participation in that great venture. Thus the United States Government had proposed no restriction on the membership of the agency or of the international conference. That was an excellent principle, for no discrimination ought to be made in that matter. On 15 November, in the First Committee (717th meeting), Mr. Lodge, recalling Mr. Dulles' statement of 23 September, had said that the United States position had been clearly stated and had not subsequently changed.

19. Why, then, should States which were not Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies be excluded? Such States might wish to take part in the scientific conference, to contribute to it and to profit from it. Moreover, there was no justification for the distinction which some persons proposed to make between the work of the agency, in which all States could participate without restriction, and the international

scientific conference with a limited number of participants. It was important that all States, without exception, should be able to take part in the scientific conference. To accept that principle would furthermore be in accordance with United States policy as set forth by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Lodge.

20. The USSR delegation asked the Committee and the seven Powers to accept the USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.106), so that unanimity might be achieved on the entire question.

21. Mr. LEME (Brazil) welcomed the agreement that had been reached. He hoped that the peaceful application of atomic energy would mark the beginning of a new era of well-being for mankind. His country was willing to participate in the small committee and would vote for the revised draft resolution.

22. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question put by Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru), stated that under the rules of procedure the draft resolution could not be put to the vote until at least twenty-four hours after it had been proposed.

23. Mr. MENON (India) considered that the draft resolution should not be put to the vote until the Committee had duly studied it. The Indian delegation had not had time to refer the matter to its Government, as it wished to do before giving its decision on a question of such importance.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution would naturally not be put to the vote until the list of speakers was exhausted.

25. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) expressed his satisfaction that agreement had been reached on such an important question. Apparently the international agency would be set up as a result of negotiations leading to a multilateral treaty which would be open for accession to all States. That novel means of creating an organ was satisfactory.

26. Mr. Lodge seemed to have borne in mind the principle of geographic distribution with regard to the membership of the agency and of its board of governors. That point was important, since the USSR had deprecated the domination of the agency by one Power or group of Powers. It also appeared to be understood that the agency would set up regional centres to study the special needs of each region. That, too, was very important. It meant a great deal to most of the under-developed countries that their problems should be studied by special regional centres.

27. Mr. Belaúnde announced that he would transmit to the Secretariat a letter from Mr. Sandoval Vallarta, the former representative of Mexico on the Atomic Energy Commission, which set forth the principle that any body dealing with atomic energy should be governed by the majority rule, not the unanimity rule. That statement reflected the opinion of all the Latin American countries. The arguments on which it was based had been embodied in successive reports of the Atomic Energy Commission.

28. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the Committee wished to close the debate, he was prepared to take part immediately in a vote on the draft resolution. However, since the Indian representative did not seem to be prepared to vote until he had received instructions from his Government, perhaps the Committee could postpone the vote until the meeting to be held on Monday

22 November, and in the meantime proceed with its agenda.

29. Mr. MENON (India) said he had not stated that he was bound to receive instructions from his Government. The draft resolution was, however, a particularly important one, and there was no need to put it to an over-hasty vote. The agreement of the great Powers did not mean that all questions raised by the draft resolution had been solved. Indeed, the greater part of the world had been excluded from that initial effort.

30. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) pointed out to Mr. Vyshinsky that Mr. Dulles, in his statement to the General Assembly on 23 September, had said that nations from all regions of the world would be included in the international agency. "Nations from all regions" was not the same as "all nations". It was obvious, too, that the proposed scientific conference would have to deal with scientific questions and not with the question of Mongolian, North Korean or East German nationhood. The sponsors of the draft resolution had by no means intended to exclude the rest of the world, as Mr. Menon had alleged.

31. He, too, was ready to vote on the draft resolution. As, however, certain delegations has asked for time to examine it, he suggested that the meeting should be adjourned until the following day at 4 p.m.

32. Mr. MENON (India), replying to Mr. Lodge, said that his actual words had been that the greater part of the world was excluded in the initial stages.

33. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) remarked that some time was need to study the revised draft resolution and the USSR amendment. As certain delegations appeared to desire an early vote, he proposed that the meeting should be adjourned till the following morning.

34. At the CHAIRMAN'S request, Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) withdrew their proposals.

35. The CHAIRMAN announced that, since there was no objection, the meeting would be adjourned until the following day at 4 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.